

Amendment
Serial No. 10/706,494

5000-1-483

REMARKS

Reconsideration of all grounds of objection and rejection in the Office Action and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-9 remain pending herein. Claims 1 and 7 are independent claims.

Claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Ishida (U.S. 6,434,171) in view of Schwartz *et al.* (U.S. 7,145,912) ("Schwartz"). Claims 3 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Ishida in view of Schwartz, and further in view of Dekeyser (U.S. 6,892,389). Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection for the reasons indicated herein below.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of references would have failed to render any of the present claims at the time of invention.

Claims 1 and 7 have been amended to recite in part "a table regenerator for regenerating a program allocation table (PAT) and a program map table (PMT) that corresponds with the SPTS by changing contents in the PAT and the PMT with respect to the MPTS when the MPTS is split into said plurality of single program transport streams separate from general MPEG data"; support is found in the specification at least at page 8, lines 2-8. Thus, the table generator regenerates the PAT and PMT to match with the SPTS and to this end, the PAT and PMT packets split from the MPTS are treated separate from general MPEG data.

Amendment
Serial No. 10/706,494

5000-1-483

With regard to the combination of Ishida and Schwartz, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the assertion in the Office Action the combination of references renders any of the present claims obvious. In the combination of references, Ishida fails to disclose a program id (PID) filter for checking contents of an inputted MPEG2 multiple program transport stream.

Applicant respectfully submits that FIGs. 2 and 8 of Ishida (and the cols. cited in the Office Action) disclose that single MPEG transport streams are input into respective PID filters. Applicant respectfully refers to FIGs. 2 and 8 of Ishida, wherein FIGs. 2 and 8 of Ishida clearly show that only the output of TS multiplexer 24c is a Multiple Program Transport Stream (please refer to the right of TS multiplexer 24c where it says "MPEG-2 Multi-TS"). Therefore, the combination of Ishida and Schwartz fails to render obvious independent claims 1 or 7, as the combination is completely silent with regard to the program ID (PID) filter section for checking contents of an inputted MPEG2 multiple program transport streams (MPTS) frame and splitting the MPEG-2 MPTS frame, as recited in present claim 1.

Nor does the combination of Ishida and Schwartz render obvious claims 1 and 7, because of the recitation that the table regenerator for regenerating a program allocation table (PAT) and a program map table (PMT) that corresponds with the SPTS by changing contents in the PAT and the PMT with respect to the MPTS when the MPTS is split into said plurality of single program transport streams separate from general MPEG data.

Thus the combination of Ishida and Schwartz fails to render obvious claims 1 and 7 at least for failing to disclose the PID filter and the table regenerator as recited in the present claims.

Amcndment
Serial No. 10/706,494

5000-1-483

Method claim 7 recites a receiving step of MPEG2 multiple program transport streams that is also not disclosed or rendered obvious by the combination of Ishida and Schwartz.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of teachings are incompatible, as Ishida provides a time division multiplexing system, and Schwartz discloses a system for demultiplexing a statistically multiplexed signal. Thus, the combination would have failed to render independent claims 1 and 7 obvious to an artisan at the time of invention as the combination of references do not provide, as a combination, any reason that the teachings should even be combined, let alone render the present claims obvious. Nor would the combination of elements as recited in Applicant's claims have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention as being within the ordinary level of skill in the art. (*KSR International v. Teleflex*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007)).

For at least all of the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that none of claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 9 would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention over the combination of Ishida in view of Schwartz. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection are respectfully requested

Other claims in this application that are dependent on independent claims 1 or 7 are believed to be patentable at least for the same reasons discussed herein above. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Amendment
Serial No. 10/706,494

5000-1-483

With regard to the rejections of claims 3 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the combination of Ishida, Schwartz and Dekeyser, Applicant respectfully submits that the addition of Dekeyser to the combination of Ishida and Schwartz still fails even to disclose or suggest Applicant's base claims. For at least this reason, the combination fails to disclose or suggest either of claims 3 or 8. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection are respectfully requested.

For all the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that all grounds of rejection in the Office Action are overcome. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

In the event that any additional fee is required to continue the prosecution of this Application as requested, please charge such fee to Deposit Account No. 502-470. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Application, it is respectfully requested that the Applicant's attorney of record be contacted at the below-noted telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

CHA & REITER, LLC

By: Steve S. Cha
Reg. No. 44,069
Attorney for Applicants

Date: March 24, 2008

Mail all correspondence to:
CHA & REITER, LLC
210 Route 4 East, #103
Paramus, NJ 07652
Phone: (201) 226-9245
Fax: (201) 226-9246
SC/sg